

Utah State University

DigitalCommons@USU

Faculty Senate & Faculty Senate Executive
Committee

Faculty Senate

11-1-2010

Faculty Forum Agenda, November 1, 2010

Utah State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/fs_fsexec

Recommended Citation

Utah State University, "Faculty Forum Agenda, November 1, 2010" (2010). *Faculty Senate & Faculty Senate Executive Committee*. Paper 424.

https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/fs_fsexec/424

This Faculty Forum Agenda is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate at DigitalCommons@USU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate & Faculty Senate Executive Committee by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@USU. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@usu.edu.





**Faculty Forum
November 1, 2010
3:00 – 4:45 p.m.
Taggart Student Center Auditorium**

AGENDA

Welcome and review of the outcomes of last year's forum discussion

Forum Discussion Items:

- 3:05** Are faculty being adequately consulted on issues affecting health care benefits? If not, how can we strengthen the process and procedures? In addition, what suggestions do you have for future changes in health care benefits?
- 3:25** What are the impacts of increasing enrollment at a time of decreasing faculty numbers? What should be done about these?
- 3:35** What are the implications of the proposal to merge the School of Graduate Studies and the office of the Vice President for Research?
- 3:45** The University leadership has stated that improving faculty compensation is a high priority in coming budget discussions. What are the top priorities of faculty for new compensation? Should we target salary inversion and compression, overall cost of living adjustments, and/or merit pay increases? (It may be instructive to look at this [video](#) provided by faculty who examine types of motivation.)
- 4:05** How do we fairly deal with tenure and promotion of faculty at all campuses (i.e., RCDE, USU-CEU, and Logan) whose role statements are mostly teaching?
- 4:20** How do we better integrate faculty at RCDE and USU-CEU into their departments?
- 4:30** Open forum – other topics of interest from faculty members

Note: "The Faculty Forum shall convene at and in lieu of the regularly scheduled November meeting of the Senate. This annual scheduled meeting of the Faculty Forum will be open to all faculty members to attend and speak, with the exception of the President of the University, the Provost, the presidential appointees, deans and department heads, or the student members of the Senate, unless specifically requested by the Executive Committee of the Faculty Forum...Participants may discuss subjects of current interest, question and debate any policies and procedures, and formulate recommendations for consideration by the Faculty Senate...The Faculty Forum Executive Committee will set the agenda for the November meeting...The agenda will include all items raised by the petition(s), together with items deemed pertinent by the Executive Committee." (Code Section: 402.9.1 & .9.2)

OUTCOMES FROM THE 2009 FACULTY FORUM

A summary of what was said at the Forum is found in the minutes (see minutes [2009 Faculty Forum](#)). Below is an indication of the resulting outcomes.

Instances of lack of attention to the Faculty Policy Manual (Faculty Code).

This led to the creation of an ad hoc Faculty Senate Committee, the Code Compliance Committee ([charge](#) and [approval](#)). An initial report was given to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC) and to the Faculty (FS) in [September 2010](#).

Its first case is leading to a clarification of the Faculty Code that will be brought to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC) shortly.

Furlough structure and budget cuts.

This led to a meeting of President Albrecht with the Budget and Faculty Welfare (BFW) committee to discuss furloughs and budget cuts. The BFW committee examination of furloughs led to reports to the FSEC and to the FS ([see minutes Feb. 1, 2010](#)) by Doug Jackson-Smith.

As for budget cuts, John Kras and Vincent Wickwar, the two faculty members on the Budget Advisory Committee (BAC) (also known as the Budget Reduction Committee), made a presentation to the FS ([see minutes Jan. 11, 2010](#)) on how the BAC worked. Incidentally, the BAC was set up in response to a recommendation by the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU), which accredits USU.

As for the perceived proliferation of administrative positions, it was discussed at FS ([see minutes Mar. 29, 2010](#)) by Michael Torrens, Director of the Department of Analysis, Assessment, and Accreditation. While an exact change over the last 10 years is difficult to specify because of re-classification of positions, the numbers appear to be down, not up.

Strategies for increasing diversity.

In response to the Faculty Forum in November 2009, President Albrecht created the Diversity Council, which is chaired by Vice President for Student Services James Morales. The Faculty Senate is involved by the inclusion in the Council membership of a member of the Faculty Diversity, Development, and Equity Committee (FDDE).

At its inception last spring, the Diversity Council began to study how best to address the following top five diversity issues/needs at USU:

1. Diversify the USU faculty, staff, and administration by [x%] for each category by [Year].
2. Improve the USU campus and Logan-area climate for diverse populations.
3. Increase USU diversity-related partnerships with Cache Valley organizations.
4. Create and implement a mandatory diversity training program for all new employees.
5. Create a standard diversity statement/code of conduct that all faculty, staff, and administrators would agree to uphold.

The Diversity Council determined that issues #1 and #3 are long-term issues, while issues #4 and #5 may be viewed as short-term issues. Regardless, issue #2 is undoubtedly the key, overarching issue; that is, as we address issue #2, we can better address the other four issues.

The Diversity Council also determined that the quickest, most effective approach to addressing issue #2 is to create a fund that will offer grants to support diversity initiatives across the University system.

Sense of being valued as faculty members.

An example of not being valued was a statement that the work of the Tenure and Promotion (T&P) Committees (actually the Tenure Advisory Committee (TAC)) was irrelevant because it was superseded by decisions of the Central Committee. The role of the TACs was discussed extensively during the 2009-2010 year by the ad hoc Committee on Pre-Tenure Mentoring and Evaluation. As with the BAC, this committee was set up in response to a recommendation from the NWCCU. The co-Chairs were Mike Parent and Provost Coward. The members were faculty. The committee compared tenure and promotion rates at USU with peer institutions and other available data. USU was in the lower range of the upper quartile of institutional tenure rates for the last 8 years. There were only a few instances where the T&P committee's recommendation was not consistent with the final action. The committee did discover a perception by a few that the T&P should act as an advocate for the candidate. As this could work to the disadvantage of a candidate during the probationary period, the committee recommended a small modification to the faculty code (Section 405.6.2(1)) to clarify the role of the TAC and to set up a training program for the TAC chairs. These recommendations went to the FSEC and the FS ([see minutes Apr. 26, 2010](#)). The code change also was reviewed by the Professional Responsibilities and Procedures Committee (PRPC).

More generally, to the question of feeling valued, the Provost used several of the questions from the Department Heads' evaluations to examine this question. The results will be presented to FSEC and, most likely, the FS. For most colleges, the results show the faculty feeling good about their situations.

Open forum

This led, as already planned, to 5-year reviews of many senior administrators. It also led to a review, a year early, of the Provost. This was a very comprehensive review including many constituencies, i.e., faculty, RCDE faculty, ASUSU leadership, six FS presidents, deans, USU trustees, and Regents. As for the faculty portion, it included all full-time faculty who chose to respond. President Albrecht presented the results of this review to the FS in September 2010.

Issues were raised about the faculty needing to take a more active role in the shared governance of the university. It was suggested that the faculty ask the administration more questions and demand more answers. However, no examples were provided. And, it should be pointed out that the questions on the Faculty Forum agenda were raised, anonymously, by faculty members. It is hard to be more open to questions than that. In addition, at every FSEC and FS meeting, under University Business, there is an opportunity to ask questions of the President and/or Provost directly or anonymously through a senator. Again, the opportunities are there if someone wants to take advantage of them.